DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 840 CS 201 712

AUTHOR Ruchkin, Judith P.
TITLE From Colonialism to Collaboration: A Language-Based Inquiry.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 44p.; Research done at College of Education, University of Maryland

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Content Analysis; Higher Education; *Institutions; Language Research; Metaphors; *Organizational Communication; *School Environment; Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

There are at least two types of analyses suitable to language produced in an institutional environment. One focuses on the manifest, first level of meaning, while the other concentrates on the latent, more complex elements which are implied rather than overtly expressed. The purpose of this study was to apply content analysis to an examination of language produced in various settings in several different colleges. A two-step procedure was employed to collect data: available written and oral records were used to develop categories of recurring concern; and data summaries were used to reveal parallel or contrasting language trends. It was concluded that (1) there appears to be a vocabulary employed in separate meetings different from that used in joint meetings, although the speakers are the same; (2) there is no particular collegiate pattern for restricting or sharing information in interviews not already revealed at joint meetings or in formal writing; and (3) complex metaphors and imagery are used to gain a more complete understanding of the institutional functioning depicted. (TS)

From Colonialism to Collaboration: A Language-Based Inquiry

by

Judith P. Ruchkin

The interconnected network of human relationships is never totally accesible to the researcher. Whether he probes large-scale institutional indicators such as the relationship between automation and control using quantitative means and even when he probes minutely into the daily functionings of individual interactions comprising the organizational network, there is a vast realm of understandings and practices whose sources especially are below the waterline or organizational visibility. But employing eclectic qualitative methods permits utilization of a uniquely human aspect of organizational functioning, namely language.

Not only are the manifest content of reports, recollections and discussions useful, but they can also aid in coming closer to those more submerged aspects of organizational behavior deriving from, and embedded in, collective attitudes and ideologies that are unwittingly revealed through language patterns. Ironic anecdotes, deprecating comments, sympathetic recollection of events, humorously perceived incidents aid in recapturing the flavor of past and even current institutional functioning. Such material is elusive and affective and especially requires systematic examination and rigorous procedures in order to yield valid conclusions. But it can lead to opening up a larger vista of organization behavior than is otherwise possible and provide additional support for conclusions reached by other means.

In this instance, the use of language analysis is data-grounded. That is, in this participant-observer study concerned with the characteristics

and development of a single school-college collaboration there were frequent references to people with school and college institutional affiliation speaking a different language - to be sure a commonplace utterance - to indicate possible utility in examining whether this was indeed the case and if so, to what degree and when? The repeated use of phrases evoking conflict such as "we got licked on that one finally. They won,"[1] began to suggest that systematic probing of language might yield a more complete and more empirically grounded picture of interactions than if this dimension were left unexplored. Similarly, a para-professional's comment: "don't tell me you brought another one (pupil)" to the researcher upon meeting in the corridor and the preceding directive to a child: "get back to your classroom," and another aide yelling over lunchroom din to child: "I am not going to clean up after you,"[2] began to raise questions about the organizational climate and status mechanisms that operate and are themselves revealed through such unplanned, "natural" means.

While people can consciously select, or withhold information from others and thereby exert important control, it is less usual once they are engaged in conversation to disguise attitudes and sentiments, which may reveal as much about organizational membership patterns and their development as the formal indicators concerned with organizational hierarchy, specialization, span of control and the like. When the two approaches are combined, social behavior reporting is more firmly grounded and enables the drawing of higher level inferences than if only the formal organizational indicators were used.

---

[1] Jones, interview, loc. cit.

[2] Conversations, December 12, 1970 and January 11, 1971 (field notes).

A Methodological Note

There are at least two types of analyses suitable to language produced in an institutional environment. One focusses on the manifest, obvious, first level of meaning, while the other concentrates on the latent, more complex, hidden elements that are implied rather than overtly expressed. Both of these approaches have been attempted in this study and will be detailed in turn.

Content analysis is not a new technique,[1] but its origins need to be recalled so that both its usefulness and its limitations may become evident. Content analysis was first developed for and applied to literary, journalistic and broadcast material. Radio and television programs, the content of the daily newspaper and works of fiction represent examples of complex and unified communication originating from a source at a given time and do not represent a multi-level, internally connected work environment. They possess an identifiable and separate source and an audience rather than instances of communication with both sources and receivers variously present in the same setting. Any one of the multilayered institutional communications record is only a segment of a vast array of the organizational network operating. Thus, no one category and no combination of communications categories can render the total universe of interaction completely. These are approximations, however, which when coupled with direct observation and a critical and comparative approach can render otherwise voluminous and often redundant data more systematically accessible for analytical purposes.

But the preference of school people for oral rather than written communication means that the emphasis in this section is on the language

[1] Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952).

of joint and separate meetings and interview records. (It should also be noted that many past sessions recorded before the inception of the current study are incomplete, lacking beginning, ending and sometimes middle portions.) While it might have been instructive to extend the analysis to formal, written communications, this was not attempted due to the relative sparseness of the school-produced data in this category.

Since ideology - professional or otherwise - is generally expressed in language, it is useful to focus on verbal interchanges if one is interested in the nature and extent of the spread of ideology, or even more simply, in the degree of apparent agreement or disagreement among cooperating institutions as revealed by their chosen representatives. Content analysis has been employed as a systematic procedure for reducing the volume of verbal interaction into more manageable units.

In propaganda analysis and in other human speech phenomena, systematic sampling has led to useful findings even in areas concerned with national security. Human speech and writing to some extent as well, are sufficiently redundant that manifest content can be derived from far less than the total record available. There was a three-step procedure employed. First, the entire data base: observation records, written communications as well as the oral records available were used to develop categories of recurring concern. Secondly, data summaries developed from the oral record were used for assigning items into the categories, which were arranged as a matrix so as to reveal parallel or contrasting trends by institution and type of data.[1] (See Table 5) Third, an open-ended tally of words used by

[1] The data were initially tallied by institutional position, but this has not revealed enough further information to render the reproduction of a 14-column table necessary.

institutional membership was completed to contrast with the second approach, more likely to contain researcher interpretation and biases.

It may be added that a systematic sampling schema, which consists of simple occurence of words, is reasonably free of researcher bias. The present sampling procedure, while exceedingly tedious, was applied to transcriptions, and unlike random selection of key phrases, which can easily be influenced by researcher's theoretical concerns and desire for neat analytical categories, used the seventh noun or action verb in every twelfth line. It is hardly possible to "make people say" what is analytically suitable through this approach. However, there are some procedural flaws that should be made apparent. When transcriptions are compared with the actual verbal data, it becomes readily apparent that the process of transcription imposes a pattern upon the verbal process, which was not present in the original verbal pacing. Thus, the far more efficient analysis of the transcriptions has its own built-in distortions. A compromise between efficiency and use of raw data was struck due to necessity. Since only a portion of the oral record was transcribed, the more time-consuming and error-prone method of abstracting the noun, or action verb, spoken every 90 seconds - the approximate equivalent of 12 lines of transcription - had to be utilized. Methodologically, the use of actual verbal record has drawbacks and similarly, when transcribing one needs to use identical size type and margins, which while generally available were not uniformly present. Inasmuch as the study is concerned with posing hypotheses and not with validating them, the lack of such methodological rigor is not perceived as unduly debilitating.

TABLE 1

WORDS SPOKEN BY INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION AND SETTING

+ = equal mention
≠ = unequal mention
x = only college usage

Numbers refer to times a word is used

Words in common include both equal and unequal mention.

Meetings (10)		College Alone (4)	Individual Interviews (24)	
College & School Staffs			College (12)	School (12)
≠ teacher (19 te. & 4 st.)	≠ children 9	people 6	≠ school 3	≠ teacher(s) 8
≠ conference 7	≠ years, day, time 9	students 3	year-times 3	≠ school 6
	≠ teachers (st. te.)8			
≠ funds 6	≠ meeting-conference5	relation-ship 3	community 2	wanted 4
people 5	+ school(s)5	money-funds 3	comitted 2	≠ work 4
≠ adults-parents 5 school 5	assigned 5	x colleagues 2 teachers 2	students 2	children 3 principals 3
	work-job 4	x role 2		
≠ children	problems 3	x research 2	way 2	classes 2
≠ reason-idea 4	≠ funds 3	experiences 2 planned 2	≠ working 2	organized 2
plans-planning 3	≠ parent-mother 3	conference 2 x called	+ money 2	program 2
aides - paraprof 3		x present 2 loose-informal 2	relate 2	+ money 2
		x employ-hiring 2	≠ staff 2	heterogeneity 2
		x project-program 2	trying	

TABLE 1 - Continued

Meetings (10)		College Alone (4)	Individual Interviews (24)	
College & School Staffs			College (12)	School (12)
Position 3 hospital- health 3 ≠year 3 group 3 informal 3 variety- choices 2 guidance 2 relation- ship 2 interaction- involvement 2	group 3 classes 2 authority- control 2 guide 2 ≠reason 2 form 2	x strategy 2 x frustration	involvement believe school board boondocks superintendent	direction believe Education Dept.
words used in common: 10	10	not applicable	6	6
total number of words: 19	16	19	16	14

Word Usage Patterns

In addition to the previously perceived differences among the institutional partners, it might be useful to know whether there was also a difference in language, or at least words, spoken. Furthermore, it might be interesting to determine whether the college staff "out-talked" school staff at various meetings, or vice versa.

The raw data is summarized in the table above. (Each column is arranged in descending order of frequency of usage. Reading down each column first will reveal frequency of word usage by categories and may prove to be the readiest method for approaching this concentrated summary. Subsequent comparisons following the symbols across the table may then become more comprehensible.)

It should be noted that for relative ease of presentation, the foregoing table summarizes the patterns revealed over five years and the high degree of parallelism revealed may be an artifact of summing. There is considerable similarity in words used and even in frequency of usage with "school," "group," and "guide" or "guidance" receiving equal total mention in joint meetings. There appears to be some foundation for the notion of a different college vocabulary employed in separate meetings, where the words used are different from those used in the joint meetings although the speakers are generally the same. In such situations, college staff tends to use such private words as: "colleagues," "research," "role," "experiences," "strategy" and "frustration." In the separately held individual interviews, there is less common usage than in the joint meetings, but there still appears to be a high percentage of words used

in common. That is, "money," "school," "teachers," "staff," "work," "believe" are used, as are references to the others' hierarchy. The clearest pattern is the extremely high mention of teacher - referring primarily to the classroom teacher - on the part of the college staff in joint meetings. That the setting may have been a source of influence is suggested inasmuch as there is no similar mention of equal magnitude by the collegiate segment in the individual interviews.

There seems to be little variation in word usage among institutional representatives in any of the situations on the range of people-things-abstractions, which is embedded in the data. Abstractions predominate in all categories and while the collegiate segment is somewhat more productive on this score (the method would become suspect if this were otherwise), the majority of the school words are in this domain also.

TABLE 2

WORD USAGE PATTERNS

	Joint Meetings		College Alone	Individual Interviews	
	College	School		College	School
Number of Words referring to:					
people	5	3	4	2	3
things	3	3	1	2	2
abstractions	11	10	14	10	9
cognitive	3	5	7	2	4
affective	5	1	5	4	1

The last two rows of the table summarize words that refer to cognitive and affective processes. Words such as "experiences," "relationships," "informal," "frustration" characterize the latter while "reason," "planning," "working," "organized" constitute the former. Taking into account the difference in total number of words produced by the two segments (s=30, c=54), the college staff used affective terms about 25% of the time, while the school people used them only 6% of the time. Although the affective domain constitutes a minority of the words used by both institutional representatives, the college pattern appears to be more affect laden than rational or cognitive, in contrast with school personnel whose words tend to cluster in the specific, procedural and rational realm.

But it may be more useful - albeit more cumbersome - to look at some patterns over time to see if the generally similar trend in overall word usage has been characteristic all along or whether it has developed in the course of shared working arrangements. The earliest jointly held meeting which has been available for analysis occured on November 2, 1966. For purposes of this comparison, it is desirable to exclude data from sessions on January 6, 1967 and May 8, 1968 since these included members of the Coordinating Committee representing the two sponsoring institutional hierarchies. This material will be discussed separately. Thus, if the remaining three sessions are examined, there does not appear to be any but a minor shift in the number of shared words during the course of this year. There is an on-going mutual emphasis on "conference," "staff" and "interaction" with "control" added in the Spring and "children" disappearing

TABLE 3

WORD USAGE IN JOINT MEETINGS
FALL '66 - SPRING '68

Time	College	Shared	School
11/2/66	delegate in charge teacher aides feel informal experience relating free	2 conference 1 1 assigned 1 2 children 1	2 form 2 modus operandi timetable guide monitors complaints be effective
12/8/66	2 position school conferences behaviors observation criteria articulateness	1 staff 1 3 people 1 3 teacher 1 1 year, day, period 2	license substitute training authority charts
1/6/67	feedback 3 college flexibility- informality reason-idea student teacher	1 years-time 1 1 children 2 2 begin 1 1 community 1 3 funds 1 1 building 1 1 meeting 2 2 group 1 2 guidelines	3 scheduled-assigned 2 problems work-job 2 building 2 ethnic balance traditional- accustomed
5/22/67	variety choice category direction-focus role-playing school needs	3 staff-teachers 3 1 interaction 1 1 control 1	2 differentiation classes - group register times heterogeneity disturbed
5/8/68	curriculum involvement experimental people 2 workshop health sophomore	2 parent 1 4 schools 4 1 materials 2 3 budget-funding 2 4 teacher 1 2 teacher training 1 1 student-pupil 1 1 children 1 1 transport-bus 1	grade paraprof housing industry early childhood

Numbers indicate multiple usage or the contribution by each segment.

after the Fall. The latter holds true even if non-overlapping words used by the two segments are considered. It is possible to speculate that discussion of children, the ultimate beneficiaries of the co-operative effort being initiated, might be approved by mutual professional code, but as interaction and mutual awareness increase, other more immediate adult concerns - not necessarily equally accepted ones - are more frequently discussed. Similarly, the high mention accorded "teachers" by the collegiate segment in joint meetings may constitute another accepted and safe topic, and deserves note in light of the interpersonal conflict reported between the two segments represented.

The comparison of the number of words in the shared category spoken at the January 1967 Coordinating Committee meeting is in contrast with the then current local trends. That is, there is far greater use of mutual words in this situation than in those preceding, or subsequent to, this session when Coordinating Committee members - the upper hierarchical levels - are present. Even in the face of a number of inter-institutional expressions of disagreement the shared trend predominates. But, this is a result of similarity of word usage between the local collegiate segment and the off-site school representation. Whether such common usage is a function of independently shared vocabularies, or a function of higher sense of consensus presentation cannot be readily determined. However, the interview materials reveal a more even distribution and thereby indirectly lend support to a higher need for apparent consensus, shared by local collegiate and off-site school hierarchy, who also happened to have

planned the project. There is further increase in the shared words category with the passage of time evidenced at the May 8, 1968 Coordinating Committee meeting. There was such overt stated unanimity at this session, which serves to underscore the validity of the frequency word count method for analytical purposes. There are only a few words spoken that are not parallel and these are more parallel than they appear per se. "Sophomore" is used to refer to a college level, while "grade" is used to refer to a school level, "health" is referred to in the context of a social problem, similar to "housing", while the college partners speak of "involvement" by others in the school, the school board representatives speak of participation by "industry."

That even such an elementary approach results in ambiguity, contradiction and complexity is hardly surprising in light of overall project diversity. Nor are there clearer trends on word dominance by institutional affiliation.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF WORDS AND SPEAKERS BY AFFILIATION AND MEETING DATE

	College		Word Balance	School	
	Number of Words	Number of Speakers		Number of Words	Number of Speakers
5/8/68	46	7	→	34	5
3/13/68	26	3	→	18	3
7/18/67	72	2	→	30	1
7/10/67	16	2	←	39	4
5/22/67	23	6	≠	24	7
3/1/67	12	1	←	28	2
2/2/67	8	3	←	21	6
1/6/67	53	8	≠	50	9
12/8/66	32	5	→	10	3
11/2/66	33	4	≠	30	3

Key: ≠ = almost equal → = source of domination

The college constituted 51.6% of the meeting membership and contributed 53.5% of word output while the school comprised 48.4% of membership and 46.5% of the word flow. This is hardly an indication that the college used such overt, obvious techniques for gaining control as outtalking the school staff. Yet, if the comparison is made over time, there is a more interesting pattern. The verbal flow appears relatively even at the start, the 12/8/66 session is chiefly devoted to the new research observation instrument and is chaired by the college person responsible for that effort, and the two succeeding local meetings clearly produce more school words even if membership size is controlled. While the summer program, which was part of the operation and yet somewhat outside the mainstream does not produce parallel trends, Spring 1968 appears to favor the collegiate element even when school headquarters staff are present. Thus, there is some indication that with the passage of time and increased familiarity, college staff do "outtalk" school staff.

Manifest Stated Concerns

In addition to examining these simple verbal categories, it may be useful to raise the analytical focus somewhat to encompass more extensive data summaries from which the vocabulary analyzed in the previous section was drawn. This category system of manifest, stated concerns was developed from the entire data base available, as indicated previously.

Rules and procedures are the predominant stated school concern, although if personnel and role are added together, this combined category

TABLE 5

MANIFEST CONCERNS BY INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

	School				College			
	Interview	Meeting	Dates	Total No.	Interview	Meeting	Dates	Total No.
personnel	10	2	12/8/66	12	7	6	12/8/66-5/8/68	13
program college	4	1	3/13/67	5	3	7	11/2/66-1/11/71	10
school	5	5	2/2/67-3/13/68	10	4	7	11/2/66-3/13/68	11
resources (money materials)	5	1	Spring 67	6	5	4	Spring 67 1/4/71	9
schedule (time)	6	0	. . .	0	2	1	11/2/66	3
philosophy	9	0	. . .	9	8	2	1/4/71-1/11/71	10
rules and procedures	6	8	12/8/66-3/13/68	14	5	5	3/6/67-1/11/71	10
roles	5	7	11/2/66-7/3/67	12	7	5	11/2/66-1/4/71	12
contol	1	6	7/25/67	7	4	3	12/8/66-4/29/68	7
formalization	1	3	1/6/67-1/4/71	4	1	4	11/2/66-1/4/71	5

TABLE 5 - Continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	School				College			
	Interview	Meeting	Dates	Total No.	Interview	Meeting	Dates	Total No.
informalization	10	1	5/8/68	11	4	6	11/2/66	10
cosmopolite	7	2	1/6/67-3/1/67	9	6	1	11/2/66	7
localite	5	0	. . .	5	2	0	. . .	0
Totals	58	36	. . .	94 (41%)	58	51	. . .	109 (59%)

outstrips all others for the school segment as it does in the collegiate portion. The college staff indicates parallel stated concern with both school and college program, while school staff express twice as much interest in school program as in the college program. In the area of resources, funding is a collegiate concern primarily since school staff have expressed not only a lower overall concern with resources, but focus on materials rather than funding as such. Quite surprisingly, there is no expressed concern with scheduling by school staff in these summaries, while college staff reveal some interest in this area. Philosophy is again of parallel stated interest and, interestingly is only discussed in the interview setting by both school and college staff with the exception of the most recent period when the college staff reveals such concern at meetings.

There is greater procedural emphasis by school personnel than by college staff. There is parallel stated concern with control by both segments. However, the school staff reveals this primarily at meetings not in interview settings. Concern with both formalization and informalization appears to be similar although here the school staff has recalled these concerns in the retrospective interview setting rather than displayed them at joint meetings. (Formalization has been used here to denote emphasis on gaining regularity and uniformity of behavior either through written specification or personally conveyed means.)

Cosmopolite indicators have included attendance at off-site meetings and/or events (professional, political, cultural and the like),

references to professional, or other, writings and outside system visitation. Cosmopolite concerns clearly outnumber localite concerns by both segments. However, while collegiate representatives reveal relatively less pull in the localite direction, the school statements contain a sizeable localite minority. Localite concerns have been seeking appointment at "own school," reference to oneself as "merely an employee," desire to remain within school system for entire professional career and restricted contacts with ethnic or other groups, differing from own membership.

While written communications have been excluded from this analysis for lack of parallel volume in the two segments, it may still be worth noting that embedded in the existing and available school memoranda are sizeable cosmopolitan concerns outnumbering localite concerns 22:6. Using the same sources, formalization out-distances informalization 26:12. Using the written communications channel does not alter the already revealed collegiate patterns on any of these categories.

As noted earlier, philosophy appears to be a topic for interviewing rather than heard at joint staff meetings. (This is not an artifact of the interviewing, however, since questions of philosophy were not initiated by the researcher although volunteered philosophical leads were followed when offered.) There appears to be no particular collegiate pattern of restricting, or sharing, information in interviews not already revealed at joint meetings or in formal writing. There is a dispersed pattern of concern in this institutional segment while the school portion reveals a somewhat more concentrated pattern. Discussion of personnel and informalization are apparently interview topics not dealt with in joint

meetings by school representatives. In contrast, control concerns are revealed in meetings and almost non-existent in the interviews. This becomes particularly interesting if the mechanisms for handling conflict are abstracted from the preceding verbal material.

Time, and all that goes with it, increases stated unanimity and decreases expressed conflict. Moreover, not just increased interaction influences degree of agreement, but status levels as well. That is, the higher the respective institutional representatives rank within their own institutions, the greater their agreement with each other. Conversely, stated disagreement is voiced by those on the middle, or even lower, levels and at relatively early stages of the project. There is no recorded instance of directly expressed disagreement among top level representatives in any group setting. There appears to be a hierarchically related consensus seeking pattern in verbal utterances. Although there was censorship and by special request of local top management some tapes were destroyed, the conflict reportedly involved single institutionally affiliated personnel of different status levels. Thus, even the exercise of censorship may be seen as conflict denial, or alternatively, as an apparent consensus seeking effort.

It may be useful to speculate in light of the frequently, and indirectly, reported conflict between top level representatives at the mechanism that might be responsible for such apparent public unanimity on the top levels. Are staff meetings held for such latent purposes as the need for presenting a united front? Also, might it be the latent function of lower status levels to articulate institutionally perceived

ideological opposition? And, in contrast might the top level, whose function is both internal coordination and external institutional representation be more likely to show a common ground, or consensus seeking orientation? The effect of generalists rather than specialists at the top level may serve to unify disparate specialized interests in the middle levels of the hierarchy where sociologist, anthropologist, psychologist, researcher, and curriculum specialist on the one hand, and assistant principal for early childhood, assistant principal for grades 3-4, assistant principal for grades 5-6, guidance counselor on the other side, among others, are found. Similarly, the relatively cosmopolitan characteristics of top level personnel may again favor public expression of unity and thus reinforce this as the approved professional code of conduct.

Furthermore, there is some evidence that this consensus seeking mechanism can be raised to a different and possibly even higher level through the increased ability of the institutional representatives "to take the other's place."[1]

> I have learned what Miss Murphy has to contend with as a school superintendent.[2]

> What was to some of the college people a little, you know, trivia, but for the principal was important that he get a form from a parent.[3]

---

1 George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

2 Conversation with Patricia Lyman, City View Elementary School, December 6, 1970 (in field notes).

3 Murphy, interview, loc. cit.

> At the college you have a degree of independence . . . . I suspect that whole spirit of professional status in the college is different - [1] there is less line of demarcation in the college than in school.

While there are only a few isolated comments revealing this phenomenon, it is possible that enlarging one's significant institutional others may be an indirect outcome of joint functioning.

Metaphors and Meanings

Having stayed close to the actual field data in the previous two sections, it appears useful to recall that language may be analyzed in a more interpretive, literary fashion as well. That is, in order to gain access to the complex reality of institutional interactions, not just manifest stated concerns, but more deeply grounded - possibly even below ground meanings - may need to be examined.

"Titles and rigid specialties were scrapped"[2] reports a staff member describing the 1966-67 school year. This can be accepted at face value, to mean that college staff worked informally, closely and directly with the school staff regardless of college-based specialization and concentrated on developing classroom experiences in several fields - not just their own - so as to help institute individualization. This is the elaborated manifest content of the statement and was already known in any case. However, there is a more complex, less easily ascertained, latent or (hidden) level of meaning. Rigidity, formality, distance are stereotyped characterizations held by many to characterize large bureaucracies - including universities. Thus, this brief sentence suggests

---

1 Abrams, interview, loc. cit.

2 Lester Roth, "Establishing the Environment," in TECUS Progress Report, op. cit., p. 25.

first that college staff were flexible, able to shed their previously established mode of functioning (this is what the school was expected to do, too). The verb "scrapped" is used on several levels as well. Not only does it suggest that certain formal and other institutional behaviors were discarded, but that they were "scraps," deemed worthless items, to be thrown out.

As the previous example shows, there are at least two levels of analysis possible in examining verbal utterances. There is a third level, which focusses on the imagery and metaphors employed to gain more complete understanding of the institutional functioning depicted.

"We earned every bit of turf we got"[1] is an illustration of such metaphorical use of language in which the hard work of the collegiate partner is emphasized, and makes apparent that control was sought and gained to some degree. It further casts the effort at gaining control in territorial terms. The territorial image is extended - by other informants and field observation:

> And then, Alma moved her troops in.[2]
>
> So you would have a group of indoctrinated, brainwashed clientele.[3]
>
> We deliberately planned to assault the educational front on all sides.[4]
>
> Hurrah, you'd think I was a convert to Christianity from an idol worshipper.[5]

---

1 Thompson, interview, loc. cit.

2 Edmonds, interview, loc. cit.

3 Thompson, interview, loc. cit.

4 Morris, interview, loc. cit.

5 Rosen, interview, loc. cit.

and finally and quite recently,

> Don't we want to send them out as missionairies? We don't want rigid zealots . . . we want flexible zealots.[1]

In this manner territorial control is elaborated to include an ideological dimension and the intensity, the war-like association of gaining control is stressed. While the above examples are among the clearest and most powerful ones selected to convey the images most readily (they were actually collected over a long time span), they include both the conquerors - those seeking control - and those to be converted. That is, these are parallel perceptions, parallel discussion and reporting from various levels, spanning more than five years. Due to its representative and pervasive quality then, it may be possible to generalize that this was an institution-wide conception, that is, part of the organizational perspective.

Once the skeletal portions of territorial and ideological control and conquest are apparent, there are a host of secondary, less image-laden versions, which exist to support them.

> We were all happy and then the college came in, and then the college came in.[2]

> We are looking to take rooms away from the college.[3]

> We began to be part of the landscape.[4]

> Many, too many college people.[5]

---

1 College Staff Meeting, City View Elementary School, January 11, 1971 (tape recorded).

2 Forman, interview, loc. cit.

3 School - College Meeting, City View Elementary School, March 13, 1968 (tape recorded).

4 Edmonds, interview, loc. cit.

5 Abrams, interview, loc. cit.

This will be an opportunity to tour the facilities.[1]

To provide adequate space for the facilities that the project requires, the school population will be restricted.[2]

We felt it our responsibility to keep the flow of funds there - the school people were less concerned because the school was going to stay there.[3]

In the area of fiscal and personnel control:

The ESEA funds, the Title I funds were really controlled by college staff.[4]

I am writing to request allocation of ESEA Title I funds for continuation of the Teacher Education Center for Urban Schools (TECUS) Program for the Summer.[5]

The experienced teachers, who were interested in becoming resource teachers were interviewed by the college Co-Director as well as the college director of the cluster school program.[6]

Mrs. S's name was submitted by Dr. Jones of Northtown College.[7]

It was very hard at times for teachers to clarify their allegiance.[8]

---

1 Letter to college planning committee from Dean Ralph Jones, February 10, 1966 (in Northtown College office files).

2 Title I, ESEA proposal submitted by Great City Board of Education, April 28, 1966 (in TECUS office files).

3 Edmonds, interview, loc. cit.

4 Ibid.

5 Letter from Fred Ryan to a central school official, May 26, 1967 (in TECUS office files).

6 Annual Report of the TECUS program, Northtown College Department of Education, 1967-68 (mimeographed), p. 2.

7 Letter from Fred Ryan to the Associate Superintendent for Elementary Schools, Great City, July 2, 1966 (in TECUS office files).

8 Thompson, interview, loc. cit.

I often thought of the Articles of Confederation.[2]

and

Support teachers were picked because they fit a model, because they espoused certain philosophy and certain methods.[3]

According to a recent outside evaluation team, in the area of philosophy:

The ideas of individualization of instruction dominate the educational thinking of the school.[4]

Those on the inside:

The philosophy was given to us by the college.[5]

We were given the philosophy that the school was to operate under.[6]

We were told that we're having the college come here and we were going to work with the college and she told us the goals . . . we were told that if you didn't want to stay we'll let you have a transfer and help you get a school in the area.[7]

Truly produce an innovative elementary program because we were given the resources of people that I believed in from the college with a common point of view and with time to work ultimately in a school that said they wanted us.[8]

I believed in her an awful lot.[9]

---

1 Morris, interview, loc. cit.

2 Raymond, interview, loc. cit.

3 Ross, interview, loc. cit.

4 Doe, op. cit., p. 16.

5 Jessup, interview, loc. cit.

6 Rosen, interview, loc. cit.

7 Jessup, interview, loc. cit.

8 Lyman, interview, loc. cit.

9 Marino, interview, loc. cit.

and

> I used to feel that without me this program just isn't going to go on.[1]

And to spread these beliefs:

> Extensions out from TECUS and its community to ghetto areas in other parts of the city will be made.[2]

> At Elementary School X the principal has set up a model 5th and 6th grade TECUS school within his school . . . individualized instruction in heterogeneously grouped classes as developed at TECUS.[3]

> All the support teachers were well known to the college, were familiar with the philosophy of individualization of instruction.[4]

> The support teachers were like the go-between.[5]

> From this model the people would become the carriers of the ideas generated here . . . create concentric areas of influence into which the graduates who became teachers would move . . . feel impact of this proposal . . . center continue to be innovative to lead, almost push the people, who had come through the program to maintain a high degree of professionalism . . . an axis of influence revolving around TECUS.[6]

This is a multi-faceted institutional perspective which began life as a metaphor and is in keeping with the initial range of project objectives. These eighteen statements are selections from a far larger sample of 120 comments or written references to collegiate territorial,

---

1 Parrin, interview, loc. cit.

2 Proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Education under Public Law 531 by Northtown College, Great City, November 27, 1968 (in TECUS office files).

3 TECUS Annual Report, 1969-70 (mimeographed), p. 4.

4 Ibid., p. 3.

5 Graham, interview, loc. cit.

6 Morris, interview, loc. cit.

personnel and fiscal control, special belief system and intention to seek converts. The interpretation derived from this as yet purposely unnamed metaphor will be pursued in the next section, while its extent and sources or origins, will be detailed here.

Such quasi-statistical material is assembled so as to check the validity and extent of the institutional perspective since clearly it is more convincing if it can be shown to be held widely and manifested in as large a range of participant-observer categories as possible.

Table 6 shows that a special philosophy, or ideology, is the most often revealed aspect of the metaphor. (This category includes and exceeds the general category of philosophy in the previous section, which was derived from data summaries, rather than from incidents as are the categories in this section.) Spatial control, which is where it all started comes next, followed by control of personnel, converts and intermediaries. These five categories are equally widely distributed and are present in seven of the eight possible data sources and types. The remaining two categories concerned with control over finances and school program are less frequent being found in only five sources. However, inasmuch as these are still spread over a majority of the sources, despite their relative infrequency they are held as part of the perspective. Their sources represent both institutions as well, thus raising level of credibility somewhat.[1]

The elaborated institutional metaphor is distributed almost exactly

---

[1] It may be that in the area of finances, there are relatively few individuals acquainted with its complexities in this setting thus reducing the possible sources of information. The relatively small size of the program dimension may be an artifact of its common occurence in the context of philosophy of individualization of instruction, which would preclude it being scored separately.

TABLE 6

DATA SOURCES FOR METAPHOR NO. 1

	Observation	Interview	Recorded	Group Meeting	Conversation		Documents		Total
	(Notes)	Statement	Observation	Prior	Alone	Others	Internal	External	
ideology		4	1	6	3	5	8	7	34
converts	2	8	2	4	1	4	0	2	23
intermediaries	7		1	1	4	2	4	2	21
C space	3	5		3	5	1	3	6	26
O personnel	2	3		5	2	2	5	6	25
N finances		1		3	1		3	4	12
T program		2		4	1		1	1	9
R									
O									
L									
Total	14	23	4	26	17	14	24	28	120

evenly among the two institutions with both the conquerors and the conquered aware of this process on some level. It is, however, of further interest that there is a considerable decline of statements comprising the perspective over the course of the project. Selecting the only later source that is reasonably uniformly available over the span of project functioning leads to documents and reveals an initially high number of comments and their virtual disappearance more recently.

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY OF METAPHOR IN DOCUMENTS

Year	Number of Times
1965-66	11
1966-67	11
1967-68	14
1968-69	8
1969-70	5
1970-71	2

It may be necessary to recall that such internal and external documents included portions of the metaphor, not all of its elaborated parts. However, the pattern revealed appears to be consonant with the initially rising tide of control and its subsequent alteration evident in different stages of project functioning.

The purpose of this rather extended and eclectic analysis of language patterns has been to come closer to the minute, fragmentary indicators, which are themselves produced by, and contribute to, the network of interconnections that bind or divide a dual organization. The effort was also undertaken as a counterweight to more remote, quantifiable, organizational characteristics. By first setting the stage, adding the outer organizational

features next and proceeding inward to sentiment and affect expressed in language, a more complete description of institutional patterns is gained to serve as a foundation for generating hypotheses.

Finally, the Metaphor

While the elements of the mysterious, unidentified metaphor have been selectively presented, no label has been attached to them so far. To summarize briefly, the language either directly or indirectly evokes "troops," "earned turf," "assault," territorial control, "allegiance," "philosophy of individualization," "go-between," "missionaries" and "axis of influence." But it should be stressed that the hypothesis was not initially derived from participant statements. It was first seen rather than heard. As elaborated in field notes:

> What seems to be happening is an actualization of the formal organizational structure, i.e. the Co-Director of TECUS does, in fact, share in running of school: mercurochrome for child, lateness of staff member, discussion of library rug, etc. Whether there is reciprocity involved remains to be seen, although the principal's initial description would indicate otherwise. . . Why are there no public school personnel in student teaching seminars, or at staff conferences? Does the principal interview prospective TECUS students also? He does the talk that the Co-Director gives to the visiting college students. How about the participation of other supervisors? Does this mean that only college people expand into public school territory? Is this territorial conquest?[1]

General collegiate domination and fiscal control were also apparent in the live data recorded during staff meetings held in the early years of operation.

The college Co-Director served as chairman and was responsible for the agenda although other cabinet level participants could add items

---

[1] Post Observation Reflections, December 10, 1970.

during the session. Collegiate domination was assumed through this orientation mechanism and also by actual directive to the principal: "Did you want to make that call now?"[1] Collegiate ties to the upper levels of the school system were revealed when news of budget modifications was first made known to college staff, who in turn, informed the principal.

From the earliest days in the field, the observed pattern of institutional cooperation appeared to consist of collaboration by non-collaboration. More specifically, school and college work together by not working together directly. That is, college staff were unmistakably present on school grounds, actually occupied classrooms that had once upon a time been intended to serve 450 additional children including those with special needs due to mental retardation. They were co-existing in the setting without visible, regular, direct interaction with the school staff, or hierarchy. They communicated primarily through either higher status or lower status, student intermediaries. "We saw the student teachers as the college's link, as our entree to the teachers."[2] Not only do college students serve as links, but school pupils as well, who have been regularly observed entering the collegiate sanctum at the end of the day and helping themselves to the cookie jar, or candies, centrally located on the conference table. It is just this degree of informality, home-like atmosphere that makes description of the TECUS setting and structure full of ambiguities and contradictions. Despite the initial open-door philosophy and the openness with which youngsters

---

1 School - College Meeting, City View Elementary School, December 8, 1966 (tape recorded).

2 Conversation with Patricia Lyman, City View Elementary School, January 13, 1971 (field notes).

enter the college territory, the college staff meetings were not attended by any school staff. These regular weekly meetings were held behind closed doors, a strikingly atypical pattern in its environmental and attitudinal context.

There were other indicators of isolation, separation, or segmentation apparent. The early morning 8 a.m. sessions held by the college Co-Director were, of course, open to anyone who cared to participate, but, in effect, it fostered separation between college and school staffs since none of the former attended. These sessions give evidence of open, working relationship, liking, sympathy, humor, sense of shared past, range of professional interests, exchange of books and materials among some school staff and the college Co-Director. While attendance patterns tended to vary, there was a continuing core of six to eight (10-15%) staff members who came regularly even when the Co-Director could not be there, but no college faculty was ever observed, or reported to be present.

Not only were college staff not observable in school classroom settings, but they were reportedly rarely there and then only briefly. And while those with several years of service at TECUS revealed considerable familiarity with classroom teachers' styles and behavior, there was an instance of self-reported lack of acquaintance between a college staff member with three years of service and a teacher, who was a graduate of the TECUS program. This further reinforced the pattern of physical separation and segmentation evident throughout the structure. In fact, without an urban high rise apartment living style, it is difficult to conceive of such a phenomenon in this personalized, familiar, informal

structure.

Physical separation was perceived in the workings of the college and school leadership as well. There was no instance of observed interaction between the top echelon representatives in either office. They tended to meet on neutral territory - hallways, classrooms, auditorium and the like. While the school has heterogeneous classroom grouping, its adults tend to group homogeneously by institutional affiliation and also, further, by level.

Territorial segmentation is also accompanied by "sense of isolation" perceived by some college staff, who feel removed from the college, "invisible," unknown, and disconnected from the intra-institutional structure there. This twofold pull is not just a recent phenomenon. It was revealed early in the life of the project:

> None of us are (sic)going to be here in the building, is that what we are saying?. . . Some kind of skeletal business has to be here . . . . We could leave Rosemary to call us in an emergency . . . . So that we don't get locked out of the conferences that are important to us.[1]

In addition to the dual institutional ties, there is a common ideology to which varying degrees of commitment are exhibited. The strength of the commitment appears to increase with higher status and length of association in the collegiate segment. Not only is there a shared faith, but there was until recently a mechanism for spreading it via new missionaries, supported by a more experienced teacher and sent in groups to other schools in the inner city. Both this aspect of the program and the actual initiation process were dependent upon the existing power structure, which was to be invaded, assaulted and converted in the process.

Without further support for its metaphorical association, it may be

---

[1] Discussion at College Staff Meeting, City View Elementary School, November 2, 1966 (tape recorded).

appropriate to suggest that this instance of school-college cooperation has been cast in a "colonial" framework from the time of its inception. Its dual professional authority system can be compared to that of a nation with its own system of governance on top of which is superimposed not just the new products, but the missionaries and faith and eventually, the direct presence and control of a powerful foreign nation seeking to bring its superior ways to the backward "idol worshippers." A treaty, legitimating the entry of the foreign missionaries and traders, was worked out with those in command and as a result there were no major battles, only a series of small skirmishes as the superiority of the troop strength present was visibly asserted. While on the surface this appeared to be a peaceful conquest, from the viewpoint of those whose territory was being occupied, there were too many troops, too soon. There were casualties, especially among those who were so used to the old "idol worshipping" ways that they could neither accept the new faith, nor adapt readily to the new practices it brought. The young were no longer to be raised in the old pattern adhering obediently to the elders' ways. They were now to have more choices, freedom, open spaces and opportunities to see how others live and work elsewhere. They were to be exposed to new mysteries as well as old beliefs. They were to be accorded respect, consideration, and individual treatment rather than be measured against the uniform standards of the elders.

The new faith was uncontested for the most part. There was even a ready convert among the natives, who had some prior knowledge of the

faith and was used to help lead his people to acceptance and reduce possible sources of resistance. No overt, local opposition was manifest although some of the tribesmen moved to areas where outsider control did not penetrate and the young continued to be trained in time-tested fashion. The new faith spread by new recruits and generally young missionaries made some headway both in the circumscribed area of initial physical contact and by establishing outposts in more remote areas.

A corps of intermediaries was carefully trained and indoctrinated over a period of time both in the home country and in the newly conquered land. They began to replace the functionaries who had been in charge and had previously educated the young. As the indoctrinated missionaries took over, colonial leadership gradually reduced pressures through direct surveillance and attempts at conversion. Therefore, those who survived the first phase of the encroachment and the expanded sphere of foreign influence remained and continued to exert their traditional power together with the more recent converts.

Since there was reduced support from the initial sponsors of the foreign exploration, the size of the missionary force was reduced. This resulted in the greater centralization of foreign power in the hands of the local head of the expeditionary forces, who had been trained largely in this outpost and was acquainted with local mores, and was, in turn, well known to the inhabitants. In consequence, concurrent with centralization of authority there came to be a greater reliance on previously established, pre-colonial, native structure and the reduction of close association among differentially affiliated and socialized representatives. This was an era of accommodation, power consolidation, building on the gains of the larger, more extensive initial conquest.

With diminished resources but undiminished zeal for the faith, the new leadership turned to secure the flow of new recruits to ensure survival. At the same time, small cadres of locally trained missionaries continued to be dispatched to other heathen centers accompanied by more experienced intermediaries, who would help pave the way in the hostile land and ensure that the faith was maintained. Replacements in the missionary training force were difficult to find in the home country and, in consequence, somewhat sympathetic and indoctrinated trainers were pulled in for this purpose from the native ranks. But, this was not always satisfactory. However, those from the home country who undertook the arduous service of training new recruits abroad presented problems as well. Some felt removed from their previous associations and home base supports and consequently suffered a sense of isolation and banishment in the foreign outpost, while others began to go native by adopting local mores and practices rather than adhering to the standard code of behavior at home.

Customs and relationships developed which left the training of new missionaries to the foreigners present, and the running of the local order and rearing the young to the natives. Thus, a parallel structure emerged in which two previously autonomous systems operated in tandem. This dual arrangement worked largely through long-term understandings rather than through available troop strength or the creation of a new code of rules. It was potentially vulnerable to being overthrown, too, since its existence now was dependent on mutual cordiality between local leaders, with the early signatories to the treaty legitimating the foreign influx preoccupied by battles on other fronts.

The Appropriateness of the Metaphor

There are several problems with using the colonial mode as an interpretive metaphor, which need to be made explicit. Words have both denotative and connotative meanings. The same phenomenon applies to terms that designate historical periods. A rejection of, even an opposition to aspects, or even the totality of a historical era may so influence perceptions that the negative affect so evoked is transferred to another situation where the terms are applied in the hope of illuminating by analogy. Particularly with respect to colonialism and imperialism, such negative associations are so common that it needs to be made clear at the outset that no pejorative intention is present in the current metaphorical application of terms. In utilizing a charged description, the associations conjured up should not be taken as applying directly to the entire cooperative unit, or the relationships of its sponsors. The analytical metaphor refers only to those portions that have been abstracted from the cooperative experience because they appear to be generally rather than locally and peculiarly applicable. If the metaphor has analytical usefulness, it derives from its applicability to common features of many cooperative ventures[1] rather than from its accuracy as a case description. It may also possess further utility by reducing organization complexities and detail.

The "colonial" mentality of white school people is much derided in

---

[1] Alvin Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954) p.8.

many inner-city, black communities today, which emphasizes the negative aspects of imperialism.[1] However accurate, or inaccurate, an assessment this may be is not at issue here. It is merely cited quite openly as a warning against construing these terms in a condemnatory vein toward the particular program to which they are being applied for purposes of widening insight. If other terms existed that equally, succinctly, accurately and evocatively summarized the characteristics of: control of space, personnel selection and economic resources, all in the service of a strong commitment and belief in a particular ideology, to which converts were sought, and for which further outreach posts were established, I would have been happy to employ them, so as to avoid the negative association of colonialism. However, the historical parallels appear instructive and sufficiently powerful, to merit consideration.

But, it would be inaccurate to ascribe what is here analytically derived from observation and staff statements to practitioner perception. There is no overt independence movement although again there are signs of some desire for a separate entity. If the natives- another charged word - are restless, it is generally attributed to being on view: "living in a fishbowl," trying a variety of things, and being pulled in a variety of directions. There is no overt grassroots desire for autonomy. On the contrary, if opinions were sought of the staff and administration desire for continuing collaboration, it is predicted that there would be overwhelming response to keeping the outsiders due

---

[1] Colonialism and imperialism are commonly equated in such discussions as they are in this study although degrees and kind of control as well as time and geography differentiate the two eras.

to personal liking and professional benefits. Interestingly, the native power centers, as exemplified by the local chiefs of the school board and the former superchiefs, are the sources of opposition. This is not dissimilar to sources of colonial rebellion, which were sparked not by the man in the street, but by those whose positions were usurped by the outsiders. Again, whether the collegiate control filled a vacuum, took away local prerogatives, or is simply questioned on the grounds of low productivity is not at issue in this discussion. All that is being argued is that utilizing the colonial parallel in a variety of ramifications permits a more comprehensive interpretation that brings together many seemingly disparate elements. Such coherent interpretation is made possible by exercising considerable selectivity in utilizing available evidence. The validity of this analytical selection was subjected to careful scrutiny with respect to extent and distribution of observer perception earlier, which established both the existence and distribution of the metaphor as part of the organizational perspective.

But there was also another less widely applied metaphor employed by a comparatively narrow range of participants that was directly applied to the project, especially more recently, which evokes an entirely different set of associations from the first one. To wit:

> We are like one big, happy family.[1]
>
> Like children playing one parent against the other.[2]
>
> He was like a matchmaker.[3]

---

[1] Jessup, interview, loc. cit.

[2] Interview with Barbara Jerome, City View Elementary School, December 9, 1970 (tape recorded).

[3] Ryan, interview, loc. cit.

We were going to be one big, happy, democratic, well-run family.[1]

This year began with birth pangs and trauma. The recently 'married parents' had many deep problems to resolve.[2]

I think it's been a happy wedding of the university and the public school system.[3]

The foregoing are quite sparse although they are direct participant descriptions of perceptions of overall project functioning. Despite researcher preference for "own" discoveries, especially along conceptual lines, it is incumbent upon one to take note of the existence of this metaphor especially because it differs so much from the one pieced together earlier.

Mixing Metaphors

Thus, two analytical metaphors, two different metaphors of considerable complexity and potential for elaboration have been perceived as characterizing the project: colonial operation and marital union. To conceive of the structure of a formal, 1,000 member work organization as a colonial arrangement and also as a marital one may appear to be more mixed up than merely mixing metaphors. However, it is the collaborative, dual, together aspect of cooperation that grounds this solidly as human experience and serves as the common touchstone for these diverse analytical conceptions.

Although these two metaphors are drawn from two different levels

---

1 Rosen, interview, loc. cit.

2 Roth, interview, loc. cit.

3 Murphy, interview, loc. cit.

of perspective, one involving large political systems such as nations, the other the unit of primary socialization, the family, their common frame of reference to joint and shared functioning is analytically applicable to an evolving structure seeking a viable cooperative mode. After all, both colonizers and marriage partners need to work out mutually satisfactory patterns. Nor is the different level of perspective embedded in the two metaphors ungrounded in the reality of a school-college collaboration in which a large organizational functioning was paralleled by an on-going small organizational entity. Both the inherent duality and the differential organizational perspective indicated by membership size due to shared sponsorship and differences in group size characterizing TECUS are contained in the metaphors. And although both apply to some degree throughout the project period, it may be more appropriate to view them as succeeding each other rather than as if the two modes operated concurrently.

The early phase of the project contains far more colonial strains than the more recent period of accommodation, which can be viewed as the predominantly marital mode. From maintaining a presence through formalized, institutionally and hierarchically determined control to informalized, largely customary and role centralized control the cooperative effort has endured. From a colonial outpost-like structure, it has turned into one resembling a family unit. This adaptation is far from an inconsequential test of organizational strength.

Those concerned with the counterproductive influence of status

differentials between students and teachers, or among partners in professional preparation, might wish to reflect upon the empirical evidence assembled here. The dual system aspect of the colonial metaphor and the rather distant relationship among extended kin embodied in the marital parallel derive from some intriguing findings.

At the start of the project there was extraordinary abridgement of social distance, especially among school and college staff, best indicated by actual sharing of offices, joint execution of school staff supervisory duties, feedback, program planning and frequent small and large group meetings. This early, intensive contact, status abridgement phase was reportedly accompanied by great philosophical and personal strain and related withdrawal from the project especially by middle level school administrators, who had originally sought assignment there. This "cheek by jowl" joint operation was succeeded by observably parallel functioning of two systems still operating in one site, linked together via the co-director role.[1] Thus the abridgement of status differentials generally prevailing between the school and college professional segments appears to have been replaced with time by physical separation - albeit within one building. Joint operation of the school and the training component by these two professional segments did not, in this instance, result in the elimination of social distance, nor, indeed, in permanent togetherness.

Those concerned with status differentials separating teachers and

---

[1] Judith P. Ruchkin, "The Development and Characteristics of a Single Collaborative Linkage System in Urban Teacher Education Viewed through Several Analytical Prisms," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1972.

students might reflect, however, that in this case, concurrent with the initial diminution of status differentials between school and college staffs there was an unintended decrease in conventional, direct, circumscribed, formalized college supervisor - trainee contact. Due to the complexity of the project initiation and maintenance activities, college staff recall somewhat apologetically that their efiorts were mainly concentrated on the school transformation goal rather than upon the professional preparation component. However, the initial trainees, employed at the site during the fifth year of operations, look with nostalgia upon that phase as a period of ferment and productivity when their talents were engaged in creating a new effort. Instead of receiving direct supervision and formal instruction, these trainees aided college personnel in the establishment of the school program and the conversion of the school staff - that is, they were participants in the same struggle. But, with the passage of time, this sharing a common task orientation was followed by a more predictable, ordered, scheduled and formalized interaction among college students and faculty, tantamount to the reassertion of status differentials. How the apparent conflict between organizational requirements for identification and allegiance as well as predictability, reliability, coordination and control - often manifest in status differences - may be resolved in a maximally productive and individually satisfying fashion on a long range basis remains a key question.